

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
DALLAS DIVISION**

<b>MARK WILLIAMS,</b>	§	
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	§	
	§	
	§	<b>Civil Case No. 3:16-CV-391-M-BK</b>
<b>v.</b>	§	
	§	
<b>HEALTH TEXAS PROVIDER</b>	§	
<b>NETWORK,</b>	§	
<b>Defendant.</b>	§	

**ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION OF  
THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

The United States Magistrate Judge made Findings, Conclusions and a Recommendation in this case. Plaintiff filed objections, and the District Court has made a *de novo* review of those portions of the proposed Findings and Recommendation to which objection was made. The objections are overruled, and the Court ACCEPTS the Findings, Conclusions and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, Plaintiff's claims are **DISMISSED**.

The Court prospectively CERTIFIES that any appeal of this action would not be taken in good faith. *See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3); Fed. R. App. P. 24(a)(3).* In support of this certification, the Court adopts and incorporates by reference the Magistrate Judge's Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation. *See Baugh v. Taylor, 117 F.3d 197, 202 and n.21 (5th Cir. 1997).* Based on the Findings and Recommendation, the Court finds that any appeal of this action would present no legal point of arguable merit and would, therefore, be frivolous. *Howard v. King, 707 F.2d 215, 220 (5th Cir. 1983).* Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 4(a) governs the time to appeal an order. A timely notice of appeal must be filed even if the district court certifies an appeal as not taken in good faith. In the event of an appeal, Plaintiff/Petitioner may challenge

this certification by filing a separate motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* on appeal with the Clerk of the Court, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. *See Baugh*, 117 F.3d at 202; Fed. R. App. P. 24(a)(5).

SO ORDERED this 15 day of June, 2017.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
BARBARA M. G. LYNN  
CHIEF JUDGE